

I would like to express my deep concern about the affect that implementation of this technology (BPL) will have on the operation of my Amateur Extra Class radio station (AE1X).

I am engaged in the use of transmitter power levels below 5 Watts. The signal strength of signals at this level at distant locates are quite weak (i.e. report of 339 received for a path of ~850 miles between my station AE1X in MA and W4QBE in GA on a frequency of 10.113Mhz. at a powere level of 125 mWatts).

My main concern at this time is the apparent shift from the protection of licensed radio services from interference from Part 15 devices to forcing licensed radio services to have to compete with this class of device for the allocated frequency space. It appears to me that the benefit to the public will henceforth be measured by the level of economic activity encouraged by regulations rather than the general benefit to the community that the service provides.

Commission Abernathy, in an appearance before an industry support group, has indicated that radio regulation should be based on the economic benefit a system provides ahead of any other concern. This to me indicates that at least she is willing to abandon the service model that has been in place since frequency spectrum has been regulated by the FCC and by the Commerce Department that regulated this resource in the time prior to 1938 which allocates bands of frequencies to provide for the orderly implementation and operation of services in favor of a model where the service that provides the best economy return will receive the primary allocation of this limited resource.

The industry filing does not appear to address the technical issues in this case well at all. It would seem to me that there should be a technical showing on there part that specifically addresses the actual signal levels expected in the area around a proposed system and the expected affects licensed radiators will have on the performance of these systems.

The measurements that I have seen to date appear to indicate to me that I will not be able to communicate at the power levels that I use and maybe not even at the nomimal power levels in general used in our service which are in the neighborhood of 100 Watts.

The Industry proposal does not provide any guidance concerning the level of protection that they will require from interference due to the egress of legally generated radiation from licensed stations. The Radio Amateur community has been in the public eye in multiple cases where the public outcry has been shrill when a television or other electronic device has its performance impaired by legally generated signals. I can only imagine the outcry that will arise should this system be implemented and someone have a file transfer delayed or worse corrupted because of my 50 Watt transmitter output. I have nasty problem at the moment with my 50 Watt transmitter interferring with a touch lamp. I have to keep my power output below 10 Watts to avoid the problem I have now.

The truth is that the filing in question only addresses their

perceived need from this service because there is significant economic gain to be realized once the licensed services are cleared in favor of the new occupants. The Industry can not appear to be the bad guy in this debate because it would undermine the confidence of the investors that have a huge stake in the successful deployment of this service.

In end, there seems to be a large number of technical questions that have not been adequately addressed by either side in this issue. I find the comments filed by NTIA indicating that they are initiating a measurement program to assess the impact of this service on the governmental users. I know that the ARRL will continue to do research in this area, but the Industry should also be doing its share. Unfortunately, the Industry can not and will not make sufficient details of their systems available so that proper tests can be devised independently of themselves to resolve the many technical questions raised to date. The system details in many cases are withheld because of the proprietary nature of their technology.

I must trust the Commission to make the appropriate choices in this case and I hope to continue to participate in this proceeding.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kenneth E. Stringham, Jr. AE1X, PG-1-19901, BSET

AE1X:kes